



KNOWLEDGE . . . LIBERTY . . . UTILITY . . . REPRESENTATION . . . RESPONSIBILITY.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1835.

NO. 50.

NOTIONS ON HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY.—NO. I.

Among the revolutions which have marked the way of nations, their rise and fall—the abrogation of opinions implicitly revived for ages by the developments of chemistry—and the new elements discovered which supercede the old—history itself is in the full tide of revolution. Notions which prevailed a century ago, as eternal and infallible, are now exploded; and we not only know our own world as it is, better than our predecessors knew theirs; but antiquity has become better known than it was a century ago. We may give an illustration by quoting Voltaire, who in his day was a sort of oracle to the learned. Speaking of Geography he deprecates the state of Geographical knowledge.

“No one has yet been able to make a correct map of Egypt, nor of the borders of the Red Sea, nor of the vast country of Arabia; of Africa we know only the coasts: all the interior is no more known than in the times of Atlas and Hercules. There is not a single well detailed map of all the Grand Turk’s possessions in Asia; all is placed at random, excepting some few large towns, the crumbling remains of which yet exist. In the states of the Mogul something is known of the relative positions of Delhi and Agra, but from thence to the kingdom of Golconda, every thing is laid down at a venture.”

It is not necessary to quote more at large, because every thing which is here described as defective or erroneous, is no longer so: Voltaire died in 1778—and Egypt and the Red Sea, and Arabia, are well known and mathematically mapped. There are twenty excellent maps of Turkey in all its extent; and the countries indicated in relation to Delhi and Golconda are as well known as Switzerland or Calabria. We know not only their positions, but their history; and the powers of Asia are as familiar to the attentive reader as those of Europe.

The influence of commerce and the policy of States has wrought this revolution; and it has led to the re-investigation of ancient History. Niebuhr the elder was the real pioneer in Arabia and Northern Asia, his son and son’s contemporary Heeren, have redeemed from the rubbish of ancient legends and monuments, a less fanciful and more rational account of ancient History.

The English conquests in India, and the French invasion of Egypt have concurred in supplying that knowledge of which Voltaire saw necessary not quite a century ago.

Yet this revolution in knowledge of history, does not proceed with even pace; there is a resistance to its progress, and a jealousy of its discoveries; and this silent, but never ceasing resistance, operates to maintain the longer age of ignorance.

Among the volumes of cheap literature issued within the few years, since the schoolmaster has been abroad, in a late number of *Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal*, there is an article on the sources of History; which the writer comprises in the Poems of Hesiod and Homer, and the Hebrew traditions. This circumscription is evidence of the repressive power, since it argues total ignorance or wilful suppression of the knowledge developed by those modern critics; as well as of that knowledge which has been diffused by English writers on Asiatic

history. The never to be too much admired writings of the Colebrookes, Sir John Malcolm, on Persia and India; of Mr. Elphinstone, on Cabul; and that splendid revelation of ancient history and ancient people in the two portly volumes of the *History of Rajasthan*, by Col. J. Todd; not to mention the lighter but intelligent travels of Frazer, Burns, McCartney, Connolly, Morier, &c. abound in more knowledge of ancient things.

The researches of Heeren, on the intercourse of Europe, Asia, and Africa, render out of date and credit the histories that are founded on Greek and Hebrew foundations; and it may be an amusing task to look at the manner and the authorities upon which the standards of Universal History, in 100 volumes, have been constructed; and to know something of the authors of that history, of which we have before us a list.

Salé, the celebrated translator of the Koran, was the writer of the first volume; and all that imaginative cosmogony and professed history which follows it,

George Psalmanazar, very memorable in his day, wrote the second and part of the third volume, which was finished by another remarkable man, *Archibald Bower*; by Captain Shelvocke and Dr. Campbell; *Psalmanazar* also composed the fourth volume; the fifth and sixth were by Mr. Bower; the seventh and eighth by Mr. Swinton and Mr. Bower.

Mr. Swinton alone composed the History of the Carthaginians, Numidians, Mauritanians, Getulians, Garamantes, Milano-Getulians, Nigritia, Cyrenaica, Marmorica, Syrtica, Turks, Tartars, Moguls, Indians, Chinese, on the peopling of America, and the independency of the Arabs; Birth of Abraham, by Capt. Shelvocke; of the Jews, the Gauls and Spaniards, and the retreat of the ten thousand under Xenophon, by *George Psalmanazar*.

The History of the Persians, and of the Constantinopolitan empire, by Dr. Campbell, and of the Romans by Mr. Bower.

This Universal History, which altogether amounts to 100 volumes, is composed upon the same authorities as are referred by what are denominated the orthodox; though in their Chronology they have adopted what is called the *Samaritan* theory, which is not so remote in its date as that of the Septuagint, but later than the Hebrew theory of the Protestants of Europe.

Mr. *Salé* is a writer of high and merited reputation.

Archibald Bower and *George Psalmanazar* are men who have made a very conspicuous but ambiguous figure in the world. Of the literary capacity of either there can be no question, though both have left their lives a mystery.

George Psalmanazar appeared in London about the year 1713, under the designation of a stranger, ignorant of the languages of Europe, and speaking only that of his native country, which he said was the Island of Formosa. He was an object of great curiosity for some years; he published a Grammar and Vocabulary of the Formosan language; and acquired the English language with surprising facility, and he published an octavo volume of his own biography. But this language he invented, and his memoirs were likewise a fabrication; his latter works he

wrote for the booksellers, leaving his true name and history unknown; but generally presumed to be a native of the south of France, who had been a member of some monastic order, from which he was either expelled or had deserted.

Archibald Bower was a native of Scotland, and is best known by his history of *The Popes*, which involved him in a controversy. *Psalmanazar*, who was his contemporary, censures his part of the Universal History; and in fact it is not only defective as to facts but blameably diffuse upon subordinate subjects. *Bower* obtained patronage, and even official employment, but he died in no enviable repute in 1750.

Mr. Swinton was a Fellow of the Royal Society, and had travelled in the Levant. He embodied all the historical traditions and traditional histories of his time, in a narrative, which embraces all that was then recognized among the learned. But it is no longer a history to be referred for a knowledge of what is or was. Of the others we know little or nothing.

It is not necessary to go into a search of their biography; time and the progress of discovery and knowledge has left the Universal History as a mere *note book* of subjects to be re-examined and recomposed.

Great confusion arises out of the diversity of historical periods or epochs. It is in this particular that the remark of *Livy* is too applicable. The priesthood in all ancient nations of which we have any records, were the regulators and the depositories of historical time. There seems to have been a competition among nations for priority, and time itself was measured by every unequal laws.

The day and night were measured by their natural progressions; the phases of the moon presented another natural measure; and in the imperfection of knowledge as to exact time, the four changes were apportioned into seven days each; and the four combined framed the month, the lunar month. The season varying in different latitudes near or remote from the Equator; the Hindoos had six seasons and so had the Romans; further north the seasons were four, and the farthest north but two.—As the form we are most accustomed to in our northern attitudes is that of the four seasons, the year was made up of that portion of time in which the seasons recommence.

So that there were portions of time composed of two months where the seasons were six; of three months when there were four seasons; and either those periods were originally confounded one with the other; or time has not preserved the precise causes of the confusion. Thus in some computations of time *days* and *years* are confounded, which is given as accounting for the enormous periods of the Hindus, the Chaldeans, the Phenicians, and the Chinese; and the reduction of periods called *years* by taking each for only a day, the chronology of different nations were nearly proportioned though not exactly so.

In other cases weeks, months, quarters, and half years have had the common denomination of years; and it is in this way that the ages attributed to the patriarchs are accounted for and reconciled to the laws of nature and experience.

But after the many ages which preceded astronomical

precision, the modes which had prevailed gave way to measurements of time more exact. It is not in the power of the human mind to conceive how many ages must have preceded the rise and progress and institution of Astronomical laws. The slow march of discovery by which human sagacity reached a knowledge of the exact periods of the lunar revolutions; the solar phenomena; the obliquity of the ecliptic; and the periodical inequalities which take place in the apparent path of the sun when north or south of the equator; the distribution of the zodiac into groups of stars, and the assignment of portions of the great circle to the months; the discovery of planetary motion, Saturn, Jupiter, Venus, Mars, &c.

But astronomy must be presumed to have reached great perfection when nations adapted its data and laid aside the old, which had before prevailed.

Even astronomy produced its peculiar impressions. For although the orbicular form of the earth was agreed upon by all, some nations adhered to the *lunar* regulation. Others adopted the *solar*. The lunar twelve months did not correspond with the solar; and we see at this day the Mahomedans calculating time by the lunar while the European nations calculate by the solar.

The Hindus had partisans of both theories, and there remain various schemes of the zodiac founded on one or the other. In fact there is some reason to believe that a conflict took place on this subject between the contending parties of either system, and the division of the nations of India under the denomination of the descendants of the Sun and descendants of the Moon, may be resolved into the astronomical classification; and those titles which appear so insignificant, of the Burman princes of being cousins of the sun or moon, have had this origin; so that tho' it be nonsense, it had very remote antiquity on its side.

We may pursue this subject in a more specific form in a future number. These notions being intended to awaken and excite curiosity, rather than at once to satisfy it.

The mode of dividing time by epochas of unequal duration was an effort to reduce history to order and method.

The *four ages*—denominated of gold, silver, brass, and iron are undoubtedly very ancient—the Hindus formed them into a system; the Chaldeans adopted them with some variations; the Egyptians interpolated a fifth age preceding that of iron, but the Greeks who owed nearly all their science to the Hindus adopted the four ages to their peculiar taste and theory.

Varro, a Roman, a contemporary and friend of Pompey, divided time into three periods, 1 the obscure, 2 the fabulous, 3 the historical.

By a sort of fanciful analogy between the seven stages of human life and that of time, it was divided into seven ages, by Johannes Damascenus.

A more whimsical system still was that of Alstedius, who divided time into six epochas the name of each beginning with a C. these for example, 1 *Creation*, 2 *Cataclysm*, 3 *Chaldeans*, 4 *Cyrus*, 5 *Cittim*, 6 *Cesar*, 7 *Carthage*.

A more modern writer adopting this whim, carries on the enumeration to 14 places, also beginning with C.; the 8 Christian, 9 Constantine, 10 Charlemagne, 11 Capet, 12 Croisade, 13 Constantinople, 14 Cromwell.

Gatterer and Muller, two Germans of some celebrity, adopt different epochas from any of those and from each other. That of Gatterer, however, is made like that of Bossuet and Rollin, to conform with the Hebrew traditions.

The necessity of some universal standard to which all epochs antecedent and subsequent, might be referred, gave rise to an artificial Era, called the Julian; but in modern times the Christian Era has superceded the Julian, tho' this it is still referred to with advantage. A more particular notice of which, and the epochs of other nations in a subsequent number.



PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM DUANE.

PHILADELPHIA, APRIL 11, 1835.

THE NEWS OF EUROPE.

The Roscoe, Capt. Delano, sailed the 12th Feb. and the Caledonia, Capt. Graham, the 1st of March, from Liverpool, and the Utica, Capt. Depuyster, sailed from Havre the 20th Feb. and all arrived on Sunday, 5th instant, off Sandy Hook.

The political events of England are of a novel character. The ministry of Sir R. Peel and Duke of Wellington being in a minority on the two first questions put to test parties and numbers in the new Parliament.

The first question was on the choice of Speaker—when Mr. Abercrombie was chosen, in opposition to Sir Charles Manner Sutton, by a majority of 10, in a full house.

The second question was on an amendment to the King's Speech on opening Parliament—the amendment directly reproving the dissolution of Parliament, and demanding a prosecution of the measures of Reform, begun by the ministry of Earl Grey; on this amendment, the vote for amendment, 309 against 302.

Sir Robert Peel repeatedly declared that this decision was not adequate cause for him to resign.

This we apprehend is the only instance of such a vote since the close of the American war; when, on a motion of Gen. Conway, "that the influence of the crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished," the ministry was in a minority.

In France, the administration was virtually broken up, and no new arrangement had been accomplished. The American treaty of Indemnity question was not expected to be brought to issue before the end of March. Marshal Gerard was spoken of as resuming his former station in the ministry.

The Emperor Francis, of Austria, died suddenly, 2d March, aged 67; his successor is Ferdinand, aged 42. The English papers infer a change of policy from an alleged antipathy of the new Emperor to Metternich; but the experience of kings, emperors, and statesmen, authorises little confidence in such conjectures.

The civil war in Spain had not ceased. Portugal was tranquil—part of Greece disturbed—the Belgian dispute slumbering and unsettled.

AT HOME.

The transactions in the Senate for the last two sessions, have left a gloomy impression on the minds of all friends of representative government.

The extravagant proceedings, in many cases, betray a growth of depravity that is really afflicting. It has left men to hesitate upon the state of society—whether greater ignorance of what is wise, or greater indifference to what is just, honorable, and good, are the causes. For it is out of place to confine the reproach to the leaders in those acts of shame alone; those men could not set the laws of society at defiance, or in contempt, if they were not upheld by their constituents.

The transactions which are comprehended under the word *Nullification*, are unlike any thing in human annals. The *Hartford Convention* was begun in a similar diabolical spirit; but the pretexts upon which nullification began and were conducted, betray besides desperate depravity, extreme ignorance. Indeed, of the ignorance which belonged to this cool sedition—the message of Governor McDuffie holds out to all men of the least education or reading, the consummation of inveterate ignorance—to which its malevolence is but an inferior attribute.

The whole of the political operations on the United

States Bank question, affords a justification of any charge that may be made against the corruption of this republic. Princes may say as did Jugurtha, of the Roman Senate. The wickedness of the Regent of Orleans, was the act of a mercenary and dissolute despot, and the nation might be pitied rather than reproached for the miseries inflicted by him. But here we have a *majority* of the Senators of a free republic openly, in abeyance and under stipendary obligations to sustain an institution which set the laws of the country at defiance; and prostituting their votes into means of vengeance on individuals, and the denial of public justice and policy, for a base revenge.

In a new paper, just established at Harrisburg, with a *Democratic* title, we find a list of *newspapers*, which are alleged to have taken part with, or as supporting, what is called the Lewistown Convention; and among others the humble *Philadelphia Aurora* is cited. This piece of *news* we understand is one of those *little freedoms* which the Pennsylvanian is accustomed to take with *VERACITY*—it is only a second imitation of *Pinto*, that liar of the first magnitude.

FRANKLIN'S MEMOIRS AND WRITINGS.

A new edition, augmented by more than a sixth of matter not contained in any former edition, has been just issued by Messrs. *McCarty & Davis*, Market street Philadelphia. They comprehend the whole of the six volumes of the last edition, and make equal to one of the former volumes added, all comprised in two large octavo volumes.

It is printed on good paper, and on a beautiful bourgeois type, and the pages consist of two columns.

In page 233, we find the following letter, now nearly a hundred years old, upon which we shall not attempt any other notice than recommending a perusal.

"To Josias Franklin, Boston.

"PHILADELPHIA, April 13, 1738.

"Respected Father—I have your favours of the 21st of March, in which you both seem concerned lest I have imbibed some erroneous opinions. Doubtless I have my share, and when the natural weakness and imperfection of human understanding is considered, the unavoidable influence of education, custom, books, and company, upon our ways of thinking, I imagine a man must have a good deal of vanity, who believes, and a good deal of boldness who affirms, that all the doctrines he holds are true, and all he rejects are false. And perhaps the same may be justly said of every sect, church, and society of men. where they assume to themselves that infallibility which they deny to the Pope and Councils.

I think opinions should be judged of by their influences and effects, and if a man holds none that tend to make him less virtuous, or more vicious, it may be concluded he holds none that are dangerous: which is the case with me.

"I am sorry you should have any uneasiness on my account; and if it were a thing possible for one to alter his opinions to please others, I know none whom I ought more willingly to oblige in that respect, than yourselves. But since it is no more in a man's power to *think* than to *look* like another, methinks all that should be expected from me, is to keep my mind open to conviction, to hear patiently, and examine attentively, whatever is offered me for that end; and if after all I continue in the same errors, I believe your usual charity will induce you rather to pity and excuse, than blame me: in the meantime your care and concern for me is what I am very thankful for.

"My mother grieves that one of her sons is an Arian, another an Arminian; what an Arminian or an Arian is, I cannot say that I very well know. The truth is, I do not make such distinctions my study. I think vital religion has always suffered when orthodoxy is more regarded than virtue; and the scriptures assure me, that at the last day we shall not be examined what we *thought*, but what we *did*; and our recommendation will not be that we said "*Lord! Lord!*" but that we did good to our fellow creatures.—See Matt. xx.

"As to Free-masons, I know no way of giving my mother a better account of them than she seems to have at present, (since it is not allowed that women should be admitted into that secret society.) She has, I must confess, on that account, some reason to be displeased with it; but for any thing else, I must entreat her to suspend her judgment till she is better informed, unless she will believe me, when I assure her, that they are in general a very harmless sort of people, and have no principles or practices that are inconsistent with religion and good manners." &c.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE.

POLITICAL ECONOMY—PART I.

CONTENTS.—The object of the lecture—much talked of, little known, therefore difficult—many thousand volumes published—writers all disagree—the universal cause of science—the matter to be judged by writers themselves—great confusion and misuse of words—old as Phenicia, Asia, Greece—in Italy writers numerous 300 years ago—Xenophon, Solon, Aristotle—money the universal evidence—Locke and Aristotle—elucidations by the latter—the boundary of modern economy—enumeration of Italian writers before that period—able and numerous writers in France, Spain, and England—list of Italians before 1776.

You are respectfully invited to the examination of a subject in which every member of society is interested; though perhaps none is more talked of or less understood. It is therefore an undertaking of some difficulty—*first*, because thousands of volumes have been written professedly, to develop its principles. *Second*, because few are disposed to confess their ignorance of what every body professes to know. *Third*, because ignorance is the most invulnerable of all antagonists.

It is true there are thousands of volumes, pamphlets, collegiate lectures, and even cyclopedias, which treat of Political Economy, and it will naturally occur to those who are not accustomed to canvas topics of this public nature, that if there be so many volumes already, and they fulfil their promises, there can be no occasion for a new addition to this province of human knowledge.

If it were indeed true, that those numerous labors of literary men accomplished what they profess to teach, no new work, no further exposition would be necessary; but the condition here suggested, is refuted by the indisputable fact, that of all the hundreds of writers, and thousand volumes that have been written on Political Economy, within the last sixty years especially, no two agree—each and every one differing from each and every other.

I believe it is Aristotle who says—“*Politics would not be a science unless it contained truths absolute, universal, and unalterable.*” Political Economy is the principal branch of all politics, and must of course be subject to these conditions in order to constitute a practical science. If then all the existing writers fail in the conditions, it becomes very important to understand rightly what it is.

In this point of view the case is distinct and independent of all prepossession. If the writers who profess to teach fail, how are we to arrive at the scientific certainty, without which it is delusion and leads to constant error?

Some care is necessary in such an undertaking, to carry the subject clearly to the understanding; no attempt will be made to dogmatize, though it must be obvious that where there are thousands to contend with, and tens of thousands intrenched in prepossessions behind them, the very effort to investigate a given principle will have a dogmatic aspect. The expedient which is best adapted to such a case is to cite them in exposition of each other, and as the practice of the world is too much dependant on authority—there can be no dogmatism in producing the words of the writers themselves; and this course shall be pursued, because the lecturer will then stand apart, and be no more than the exhibiter of the *phantasmagoria* called modern Political Economy.

In breaking this ground, it is indispensable that there should be a clear field and no impediments—that we use no terms which we do not rightly apprehend; and where terms have been misused or perverted to meanings which vary from their true signification, that those words be fairly explained, and without calling upon the author, or reader to receive the interpretation preferred, they are only requested to take them as the sense of the lecturer, or what he believes to be the surer sense.

The last sentence of the antecedent paragraph contains the word *modern*; that is, many writers assert that Political Economy had no existence until modern times: until the publication of a given work in the year 1776. The use of this expression may appear of no importance to the nature of the subject; but if it shall appear that Political Economy has not only been understood and practised among the most ancient nations; those of the polished of

Asia, and the most refined of Phenicia and Greece, then it will be necessary in enquiring into its nature to show what it was in ancient times.

Again, if it shall appear upon satisfactory ground that in the more modern nations of Europe, more than 300 years before the epoch in which it assumes to be modern; authors, very able and very honest in the pursuit of truth, have been abundant; that they have treated of the very same subjects, unfolded the very same theories, and that the very same incongruity, and contradictions, identify them with those writers who within sixty years have set up the title of discoverers and explorers of a world before unknown, then the stumbling block of modern pretensions will be at once removed.

The Grecian history is necessarily familiar to all liberal readers; as well as the names of Xenophon, Plato, Solon, and Aristotle. In fact, the very title *Political Economy* is derived from the latter—who in his politics says that the government of a commonwealth resembles that of a household or family; *oikos* a house, and *nomoi* a law or regulation; and he deduces his principles, not from his imagination, but from the policy of more than 200 cities or commonwealths.

Of Solon it is said, “such was his capacity, that he seized on every detail, and omitted nothing which could augment the public riches or public felicity. The Athenians were ingenious and industrious, and he directed every branch of public economy, he spoke to every class and profession, artists, merchants, cultivators, bankers and the very shepherds of Diacri, and the proprietors of bees on Hymetus.”

Xenophon's Economics is celebrated for its simplicity and excellence. But there is one class spoken of, that of bankers, which I refer to only as an evidence of another fact, that is the universal presence of public economy, the existence of money, before which society must have been exposed to countless difficulties; the invention of money operated on society as steamboats and rail-roads do on our society at this day—and wherever money is found there existed Political Economy in a highly advanced state.

But much more ancient, and no doubt derived by the Greeks through Phenicia and Greater Asia, the commerce of the Piraeus of Athens appears to have had its original spring and regulation in the laws of Menu, in which are to be found all the usual principles laid down by Aristotle, but in accordance with the style which prevailed in Venice and the Italian republic in the 15th and 16th century—even to the right use of the terms rent and wages, so grossly tortured from their simple import by modern economists.

The true principles of Political Economy are nothing more than the application of experience with prudence to the concerns of man in society. John Locke says “that few enter into the study of the science of Government without reading the politics of Aristotle,” and it will be accordingly asked what does Aristotle say? the canon which he lays down I have before cited, but it cannot be too often repeated, nor too permanently remembered, that “*Politics would not be a science unless it contained truths absolute, universal, and unalterable,*” and it may be properly suggested here that if there be any thing in *modern* economy which distinguishes it from the ancient, it is in the want of absolute, universal, and unalterable truths; and the vague and metaphysical cast of its theories, professing to be the same but differing essentially in the application and the practice.

The foundation of Political Economy being founded in the necessary condition of man, is thus described by Aristotle—“Every society of men constitutes a partnership instituted for the benefit of the partners; utility is the end and aim of all such associations, and the greatest and most extensive utility is the aim and purpose of that great association called a commonwealth; which, being composed of families, the management of its affairs

is like that of a family properly termed Economy.” That is the right management of the concerns of the partnership or commonwealth.

In his Ethics, having occasion to animadvert on the principles and uses of money, he gives a circumstantial application of those purposes and uses by describing the action of society itself.

“The affairs of human society require an interchange of different kinds of faculties and exertions. The mason constructs a house, which is for the use of a shoemaker; and the product of many pairs of shoes are required to pay for it: for if the mason has employed one thousand times as much skill and labor in building the house, as the shoemaker in fabricating pairs of shoes, the prices of the one and of the other may be supposed equivalent. The principle applies to all other arts, the labors of one compensating for those of the other.

“A community could not subsist, composed wholly of physicians, or of cultivators; there must be physicians separately and husbandmen separately, and the principle remains sound, though changes of manners, government, or climate may operate to make the proportional compensation dissimilar. The instrument by which the proportions are measured, is called a standard, or the *unit* (*monos*) whence *money*, which being generally accepted as an equivalent in all the compensations or exchanges between man and man, gives to the exchanges of industry a ready, free, and certain activity.

On the origin of the term there appears to be no dispute, tho' on its application those who profess to treat of it are in extreme variance. They all agree that it is derived from *oikos* a house, and *nomoi* a law, or the laws by which household affairs are regulated.

You will perceive that without any apparent order or design I have shown that Political Economy was very ancient, and that it must have been coexistent with the exchanges of productions and the purchase with money. So that though the result of this demonstration be an irrefutable truth, there yet remains to be examined upon what foundation modern writers nevertheless assert with not a little pertinacity, that it is a science wholly modern.

As I prefer to lead your attention towards a right knowledge of the subject without the stiffness of a methodical arrangement, I have preferred to treat of the beginning in the beginning, and to proceed with an eye to Chronology, so that the facts themselves will enable any one who reads our language to form an opinion with as little danger of mistake as the most profound professor who teaches from the academic chair.

It would not be necessary in this case, as in matters of general history to mark the precise boundary which separates ancient from modern economy, those who undertake to fix it for us, furnish the precise time, and the very code by which they determine its Chronology—it is the year 1776—memorable for the more momentous and substantial establishment of American Independence.

In that year Adam Smith published a work under the title of *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. To this work the modern economists refer for the origin and the only true principles of Political Economy. Our present purpose being to enable him who hears or reads what shall be offered in this lecture, to judge for himself, it would be premature to examine the very title of this oracular work, and its utter failure to develop or explain the nature or the causes of the wealth of nations, which shall certainly be attempted in the progress of this course.

What is here intended is to show that Political Economy did exist; that 200 years before the book of Smith appeared, it formed a subject of very extensive and minute discussion in Italy; within a very few months I perused a work in fifty volumes, entitled *Scriptori Classica Italiani et Economia Politica*. It was published by Custodi, at Milan, in 1804; and, as its title expresses, gives

the essays of *Bottero*, in 1 vol., of *Antonia Serra*, in 1613, of *Davanzati*, and some fifty others; nay more—within the last three years, *Vecchio*, an Italian exile residing in London, published there, biographical memoirs of the Italian writers contained in *Costodi's* collection; and of others omitted, for what reason is not assigned; and of which I possess several myself, and among others a most ample and able discourse on money, dedicated to the Pope, and which was translated very soon after its first appearance into French. I shall speak more of those Italians, enumerate their writings, and above all I shall show, that although those Italian writers differ from each other as widely and wildly as those who call themselves moderns: yet there is not one theme or topic which has been put forth as original, by Smith, but is to be found discussed in some one or more of those writers, many of whom died a century before Smith was born, some of whom were his contemporaries, who wrote and published before he did—for example, the Count Verri, and Beccaria, his friend, wrote works which appeared in 1771, five years before Smith's treatise was heard of.

Now if those Italian writers treated of the same topics, argued them in the same way, and that Smith's work resembles them even in their absurdities, the problem is solved, unless there should appear some of his disciples, who can discover in what he is original—which has never yet been done—the title to the development of a new science, or even an old science in a new way, falls to the ground; and we must take Political Economy in the sense which it was defined by Aristotle and Xenophon, as well as by the Italian writers.

Nor shall we stop there—we shall show that not only in Italy, but in France, Spain, and England, the writers on Political Economy were numerous, long before Smith wrote; and though often found in contradiction with each other, yet many of them sustaining more rational principles and holding great influence on the affairs of their several nations.

The Italians, in the comprehensive sense, embracing all the people of the Peninsula, as they preceded the rest of Europe in commerce, also stand first in the investigation of principles which had suffered during the revolutions of Greece and the decline of the Constantinopolitan empire; the following is an imperfect list of those writers in Chronological order:

1. Scaraffi of Regio—wrote in	1579
2. Davanzati of Florence,	1588
3. Serra of Cosenza,	1613
4. Turbulo of Naples,	1619
5. Montanari of Modena,	1680
6. Bandini of Sienna,	1737
7. Broggia of Naples,	1743
8. Galiani of Naples,	1750
9. Belloni of Romano,	1750
10. Paganini of Tuscany,	1751
11. Neri of Florence,	1751
12. Carli of Capo d'Istria,	1754
13. Genovesi of Naples	1754
14. Algarotti of Venice,	
15. Zanon of Medina,	1757
16. Beccaria of Milan,	1762
17. Verri of Milan,	1763
18. Paoletti of Tuscany,	1769
19. Vasco of Piedmont,	1772
20. Ortes of Venice,	1771

Here are twenty writers of at least as great talent and judgment as any of those who pretend to be modern discoverers, by whom every topic involved in the discussion of modern economy is touched in the same way as they are treated and disputed in all the works claiming to be modern. Besides those here enumerated, I shall continue the list as given in the Italian collection and in the memoirs by *Vecchio*; they are

21. Briganti of Naples,	1780
22. Filangeri of Naples,	1760
23. Cantelupo of Naples,	1763

24. Caraccioli of Naples,	1765
25. Scrofani,	1795
26. Soleara of Piedmont,	1704
27. Corniani of Brescia,	1786
30. Ricci of Modena,	1787
31. Palmieri of Naples,	1787-1793
32. Mengotti of Feltri,	1791
33. Delfico of Abruzzo,	
34. Gioja of Piacenza,	1776
85. Valeriani,	1776
86. Rossi,	1806
37. Busellini of Modena,	1813

There are several others who have written on detached branches of Political Economy; but those who have written before 1776, are very much distinguished by their own countrymen, as *Economists* par excellence; the followers of Smith are denominated *Economists*, as producing uncertainty and confusion, where there was already too much. Smith has adopted some notions of *Quesnay*; and his system is but a modification of this. The subject is so prolific of facts of every kind that it is scarcely possible to bring it within more concise limits.

So far the object of one introductory lecture is fulfilled, as to afford those who think freely, to form a judgment independent of any other authority than facts. It has been shown that Political Economy is not a new nor a modern science—that the definition and application given centuries before our era, continues at this day. To carry out the argument, in a continuation of this lecture, it will be shown to have prevailed to a high state of refinement in England before the author of *The Wealth of Nations* was born; that in France it was practically incorporated with the laws of the state, and is at this day a subject of contention between the Statesman of Europe; and that Spain had able writers who rivalled those of Italy.

REVOLUTIONS OF COMMERCE.

We copy from the *Globe* an article on the commercial revolution which has taken place in a considerable part of Germany. In a former number of this paper, we noticed, the first movements towards these changes which have been carried into effect several years after the death of the projector. The author of the plan for a total change in the political Economy of Germany Dr. Errick Bollman, a man of great talents, great eccentricity, and after all very unfortunate.

After the failure of his prospects in the U. States, he visited Europe, and traversed the greater part of Western Germany; indeed his first great object was to prevail upon the rulers of the territories bordering on the Rhine, to relieve their commercial navigation from the heavy burden of taxation. Germany had remained behind France and even behind Spain. Under the ancient regime of France the fiscal was under the administration of seven or eight several provinces, each of whom legislated as an independent nation; and altho' the provinces were all subordinate to the monarchy, productions passing out of one into another, and successively into several, was subjected to a new tax. The frontiers of each province was lined with custom houses, and the system continued until the glimpses of a more general revolution approached. The revolution of France in 1789 overturned this impoverishing system.

Similar circumstances had left the same system in Spain, known under the title of *Alcavala*, and it extended to South America where it ceased only after the revolution, had there reached six or seven years. Merchandize, for example landed at Cadiz, paid the naval duties there. Upon the removal of those goods for transport to the interior, they were encountered at every ten or twenty miles by a new demand for taxes—the *Alcavala*, and supposing the destination to be for Madrid, perhaps the good must have paid the *alcavala* ten times. The custom grew up out of the ancient division into separate monarchies, but altho' all were united under Ferdinand and Isabella, the *Alcavala* survived for more than 300 years

These examples illustrate the state of Germany when Dr. Bollman addressed an able and demonstrative memoir to the princes and ministers of State, of the great and small principalities. His reception was not such as his plans merited; some few princes had the discernment to appreciate and applaud the plan; but the majority were persuaded it was revolutionary and jacobinical. Bollman was not dismayed. The minister to whose administration of Prussia, the subject appertained, had the reputation of enlarged views, and to him Bollman addressed himself, and he was in the full expectation of seeing it adopted by Prussia, when the liberal minister died, and with him Bollman's hopes. He entered upon a new enterprise, the collection and distribution of *Platina*. In his pursuit, the yellow fever terminated his eventful career. We now see the project adopted, and the frontier custom houses which garnished the boundaries of the lesser princes are at length abolished, and Germany takes a higher place among the commercial nations.

OUR COMMERCE WITH PRUSSIA.

It is perhaps not generally known, that the commerce between the United States and Prussia is now considerable; the official tables indeed, would induce us to form a different opinion, but the fact is, that the greater part of the trade has hitherto been indirectly carried on through the ports of other countries, such as Hamburg, Bremen, Rotterdam, Antwerp, &c. Within two or three years past however, important changes have been made in the commercial regulations of the North German States, by which the Custom-houses which formerly surrounded each have been closed, there being now but one line on the extreme outward frontier; the system of trade and duties has been made the same in all, and indeed, for every purpose of trade, they form one country. The States composing this commercial confederacy are, the kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Wirtemberg; the Grand Duchies of Hesse, Saxe Weimar and Eisenach; the Duchies of Saxe Meiningen, Saxe Cobourg, Saxe Altenburg, Anhalt Coethen, Anhalt Dessau, and Anhalt Bernberg; the Principalities of Birkenfeld, Schwartzburg, Sonderhausen, Schwartzburg Rudolstadt, Hohenzollern Hechingen, Hohenzollern Sigmaringen, Waldeck, Reuss, and Meisenheim. These together, form a country of immense extent and population, where manufactories of every description are to be found, requiring raw materials, principally those which are produced in abundance in the United States.

Since these new commercial regulations have been made, the ports of Prussia, which are all on the Baltic, have been found more convenient and advantageous for importation and exportation than those through which they were previously carried on; and the Government of that country, which has ever been anxious for the establishment of a free and liberal system of trade, has been endeavoring to facilitate its passage through those ports, by the only rational means, by removing obstacles, physical and financial, by rendering the harbors safe and accessible, the duties and expenses as low as possible. Between the Government of the U. States and of Prussia the relations have ever been most amicable, and indeed, one of the earliest treaties in which the principles of free trade, reciprocity, and the rights of neutrals, were clearly laid down, was that concluded between the two countries in 1785, through the agency of Franklin, Adams and Jefferson, on the part of the United States. It was renewed in 1799, and those principles have been more completely developed by the last treaty of 1828. The exertions of the enlightened gentlemen* who are now charged with representing the interests of each country, near the Governments of the other, will doubtless contribute to give additional activity to the intercourse between them.

By the existing arrangements between the United States and Prussia, the most perfect freedom of commerce and navigation is secured; all articles are subject to the same rate of duties in the ports of each, whether transported in vessels of either nation, to or from any other place; and those duties are no other or higher than are imposed on the same articles brought from, or carried to any other country; the coasting trade of both being of course excepted. The jurisdiction of consuls, and the rights of citizens are defined, and are as extensive as could possibly be required.

The chief ports of Prussia are Memel, Königsberg, Dantzic, Stralsund, and Stettin with Swinemund. The trade with the United States principally passes through Stettin; it is situated on the Oder, a navigable river, which passes through a large portion of the richest and most populous part of Germany, and has many flourishing cities on its banks. Ships cannot come to Stettin itself, but discharge their cargoes at Swinemund on the

Baltic, twelve miles below. A minute account of the port regulations of this place, may be found in the *Globe* for September-13th, 1834; it may be observed, that the whole of the port charges, pilotage, measurement, commissions, clearances, and price of transportation from Swinemund to Stettin, on each last of 4000 pounds measurement of a ship, only amounts to about 62 cents. A particular account of the duties, charges, &c., is to be found in the *Digest of Commercial Regulations of Foreign Countries*, published last year, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, by J. S. Smith, Esq., of Baltimore. It may be noticed, that raw cotton is free of duty; leaf tobacco pays about \$3.70 the cwt.; rice about \$2. Two and a half per cent. of the duties is also remitted on all goods imported Stettin, as a reimbursement of the Danish Sound duties paid at Elsinour.

The principal articles imported from the United States, are rice, cotton, and tobacco; coffee, sugar, rum, spices, dye-woods, &c. also find a ready market. On goods consigned, two-thirds or three-fourths of the value will be readily advanced by the mercantile houses of Stettin. Goods can also be warehoused for exportation.

The articles chiefly exported from Prussia are,

1. *Linen*, of every description.
2. *Wool*; for the sale of which, a fair is annually held in the middle of June.
3. *Woolen cloths*; of which the inferior qualities are well adapted for the China and East India trade; the finer qualities being equal or superior to those of any other country, and cheaper.
4. *Glassware* of every description.
5. *Gin* of excellent quality, made in and about Stettin: the price of it there is about 40 to 45 cents the gallon, of high proof.
6. *Zinc*, of which great quantities are brought down the Oder from Silesia.

*Henry Wheaton, Esq., who has just been transferred from Copenhagen to reside at Berlin, as Charge d'Affaires of the United States; and the Barron de Roenne, who had resided here for a year past in a similar character from Prussia.

From the Washington Globe. THE FRENCH AFFAIR.

To prevent impositions upon the American public it is well to keep attention fixed upon the proceedings of the French Government, as disclosed to us by successive arrivals from Europe.

It will be recollected that the debt due from France has been owing to the United States or their citizens for upwards of twenty years.

That on the 4th of July, 1831, a treaty was concluded, liquidating this debt at 25,000,000 francs, or about \$5,000,000, and providing for its payment by instalments;

That at the next session of Congress, an act was passed in execution of the treaty on the part of the United States, reducing the tariff on certain productions of France, the benefits of which have been enjoyed by that nation ever since;

That session after session of the French Chambers passed away, and the Executive did not ask an act to carry the treaty into effect on the part of France;

That the Government of the United States drew for the first instalment when it became due, and the bill was protested by the French Government;

That when at last an appropriation was asked for, the bill making it was not pressed as a cabinet measure, was faintly supported by most of the Ministry, and consequently was lost by a small majority;

That the King and Ministry made all sorts of apologies to the American Minister, and sent a public armed vessel to bear explanations to our Government, which had a passage so *marvellously long*, that if it had been foreseen by the French Government, it might well have been expected that Congress would have adjourned before her arrival at New York;

That *verbal* apologies, explanations, and pledges, were then tendered by the French Minister, in pursuance of instructions, which he put in writing only when it was insisted on by our Government;

That these pledges were in substance, that the King would exert his whole constitutional power to procure the execution of the treaty, and to hasten the action of the Chambers upon it, so that the President might be advised of the result in time to lay it before Congress, at the commencement of their next session;

That notwithstanding this pledge, the Chambers met in July, 1834, and were not even asked to make the requisite appropriation, although such measure would have been entirely constitutional;

That although the King had the constitutional power to fix the day for next meeting of the Chambers at any time he might think proper, yet he did actually prorogue them to the 29th December, 1834, a period so late that the result of their action on the subject, so far from being known to the President before the

meeting of Congress, could not reach the United States before the time fixed on by the constitution for their final adjournment!

That the remonstrances of the American minister were answered by declarations that it was impossible to call the Chambers together sooner, although it was afterwards done on account of their own domestic affairs; and other pretences were alleged, unfounded in themselves, and evasive of the solemn pledge which had been given, first *verbally*, and when insisted on, *in writing*, to the President of the United States;

That our minister was also informed, that the King and his ministers would not make the execution of the treaty a cabinet measure, and that the *places of the ministers* were not to be hazarded to secure the observance of the *faith* and preserve the *King's personal honor*!

So little did France and her government regard the keeping of her faith in the fulfilment of her solemn engagements, and the redemption of the pledges given by her King to the President of the United States.

The President's message came upon that government and people like a clap of thunder. It awakened them from the delusion into which they had been led by the opposition in this country, and their associate, *M. Serrurier*.

Though the message was not addressed to the government of France, or any of its agents, and there was no more propriety in taking official notice of it than if it had been a speech uttered by a member of Congress; yet, conscious of the disgraceful attitude in which France has placed herself, and the necessity of promptly retrieving her character in the eyes of the world, the King and his ministers effected to consider it as addressed to the French minister in Washington, construed it into an insult, ordered him home, and tendered passports to the American minister!

Having done this much to save *French honor*, which had not been tarnished, except by the injustice and subterfuges on which the Message commented, the King, his Ministers, and all their friends, *for the first time*, went earnestly to work to secure the execution of the treaty, the only measure which *French honor* really required.

The bill to provide for the indemnity was immediately laid before the Chambers.

It now became a *Cabinet measure*, the Ministers finding it necessary to hazard their official existence upon its success!

The commercial and manufacturing interests, aroused by the Message, poured in their memorials, asking for the execution of the treaty.

The measure was discussed in the nine Bureaux or Committees, into which the Chamber of Deputies is divided for such purposes, and a vote was taken, in which eight out of the nine exhibited majorities in favor of the execution of the treaty, making an aggregate majority in the whole Chamber of about fifty.

No doubt was entertained that the appropriation would be made, and the treaty executed.

Things were in this condition in Paris, when Mr. Clay's report in the Senate, with his speech thereon, arrived in that capital.

All parties seized on them as evidence that the President would not be sustained by Congress in any strong measure. The opposition in that country urged them as proof that there was no danger of war or any attack on the commercial interests of France even if the Chambers should refuse to pay the money to according to the treaty. They insisted that Mr. Clay's report and speech admit of further negotiations, and on that ground they urged upon the Chambers to reject the appropriation, and request the Executive to open a new negotiation, with the view of reducing the amount agreed to be paid by the treaty! If Mr. Clay has done nothing more, no man who reads the French papers can deny that he has furnished argument to the opposition in France to urge against the execution of the treaty, which had, before his papers were received there, been rendered almost certain by the proceedings of the Bureaux. Whether these arguments have been so powerfully urged as to defeat the measure, we have yet to learn. If they have, the American people will know whom to hold responsible for all disasters which may ensue.

But we believe the appropriation has been made. The French ministry cannot be ignorant that the Senate of the United States has been baffled in its vindictive war against Gen. Jackson, and that at the next session Mr. Clay will not be able to control a majority of that body. The decided stand taken by the late House, which they must be aware will be fully sustained by the next, and it being certain that France can no longer count on the Senate, will have convinced the French ministry that the President will have the cordial support of the next Congress in measures of the most decided character. They will not, therefore, think it safe to defer appropriation upon the faith of Mr. Clay's report; but seizing upon it as a salve for their wounded pride, or rather *their shame*, will make it the occasion of urging the appropriation with more zeal than ever. We therefore con-

fidently anticipate, that the appropriation has been pressed through the Chambers with all possible diligence since the date of the last advices, and the more so, as the French Ministers had a right to dread new embarrassments for themselves, if they waited for the action of the House of Representatives.

But what had roused France from her apathy and made the execution of the treaty a topic of general inquiry and discussion? *The President's Message.*

What had excited the commercial and manufacturing interest of that kingdom to pray for the execution of the treaty? *The Message.*

What had called the attention of Europe to the subject, and brought down upon France the condemnation of the civilized world? *The Message.*

What had forced the King to make the appropriation a *Cabinet measure*, contrary to his previous determination, upon the success of which the official existence of his Ministers depended? *The Message.*

What produced the majorities in the Bureaux in favor of the execution of the treaty? Not Mr. Clay's report; for that was not received when the votes were given; but *the Message.*

What produced the confidence that the treaty would be executed, which pervaded all the accounts by the latest arrivals, from whatever source, and through whatever channel? Not Mr. Clay's report, which had not been received when all the favorable symptoms displayed themselves; but *the Message.*

What is seized hold of by the opposition in France, to change the current, and defeat the execution of the Treaty? *Mr. Clay's report and speech.*

What created the only distrust that remained at the latest dates of the success of the appropriation? *Mr. Clay's report and speech.*

By adverting to these incontestable facts, the American People will be able to judge; in any event of our French relations, to whom belongs the merit, or on whom rests the responsibility.

OLD TIMES—PURE RELIGION.

Extracts from the Records of the General Court of Massachusetts.

Oct. 1657. Ordered that whoever shall bring or cause to be brought any Quaker or any other blasphemous Heretic shall forfeit one hundred pounds. And if any person or persons shall entertain said quakers shall forfeit forty shillings for each time of such entertainment—and if any Quaker or Heretic coming into this jurisdiction, if a male, shall for the first offence have *one of his ears cut off*, and be kept at work in the House of Correction—for a second offence have *both ears cut off*—and for the third, have "the tongue bored through with a hot iron."—If a woman, she shall "be severely whipped."

In this year 1657, Lawrence Southwick and Cassandra his wife, very AGED members of the Church in Salem, for offering entertainment to two quakers were fined and imprisoned—they absented themselves from the church, and in consequence were WHIPPED publicly and fined—and a son and daughter of this aged couple were also fined for non-attendance at the church, and not paying this fine, the General Court by a special order, empowered the Treasurer to *SELL THEM AS SLAVES* "to any of the English nation at Virginia or Barbadoes."

In 1658. The following order was issued by the General Court: "To the Marshall or his Deputy:—You are to take with you the executioner, and repair to the House of Correction, and there see him *cut off the right ears* of John Copeland, Christopher Holder, and John Rores, Quakers; in execution of the sentence of the Court of Assistants, for the breach of the law entitled Quakers."

EDWARD RAWSON, Sec'y.

This horrid sentence was executed in the Boston Prison by the common hangman, Sept. 16th 1650.

[The jail stood near where the State House now stands—in Beacon street.]

On the 20th of Oct. 1658—The General Court at Boston passed an act, banishing the Quakers,—for to use the words of the act: "denying civil respects to equals and superiors—and withdrawing from our church assemblies and instead thereof frequent meetings of their own, in opposition to our church order—and for tenets and practices in opposition to the orthodox received opinion of the godly"—for these offences they were "*banished on PAIN OF DEATH*!"

On the 27th of Oct. 1659,—William Robinson and Marmaduke Stevenson, suffered *martyrdom* under this Protestant law on the Gallows of Boston!

On the first of April 1660—Mary Dyer a pious woman—a wife—a mother—was hung up between earth and heaven—another martyr in the cause of religious liberty. On the 13th of Jan. 1661—William Leddra was executed. An order from the King prevented further bloodshed. It reached New England soon after the murder of Leddra, and was dated Sept. 9. 1691.

EXECUTIVE PATRONAGE.

SPEECH OF MR. BENTON, OF MISSOURI,

IN REPLY TO MR. CALHOUN'S REPORT.

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, February 9, 1835.

Mr. BENTON rose to speak to some parts of the report,—to express his concurrence in some parts, his dissent from others.

He concurred in the general purport, and in the general object, of the report, in showing the great increase which had taken place, in a short time, in the expenditures of the government, and in the number of persons employed, or supported by it. The increase was great, but not so great as has been depicted; and out of proportion to the increase of the population and wealth of country for the same period, but not so inordinately as the report affirmed. It was the object of the report to reduce this too great expenditure, and to diminish the number of the vast multitude of persons now paid, or supported, out of the Federal Treasury. In all this he concurred with the report; but he regretted, deeply and sincerely regretted, that it had not fallen within the scope of the chairman's view of the subject, to show the source and origin of these great increases; that the blame, if any, should fall upon the true authors, and the genius of reform should know where to apply her correcting hand. The omission of the Chairman to show this, had laid him (Mr. B.) under the necessity of endeavouring to supply the defect; and he should do so under all the disadvantages of an immediate reply to a well prepared report, which he had heard read once, and but once in committee, before it was now read in this chamber. The report, said Mr. B. assumes for the periods of comparison the year 1825, which was the first of Mr. Adams's Administration, and the year 1833, which was the commencement of the second term of President Monroe, which terminated in the year which is taken for the starting point of the comparison. Confining himself to these points of time, Mr. B. would look into the origin of the principal causes of the great increases of money expended, and men employed or fed by the Federal Government within this period; and would show that the implications of the report, for direct assertion was not made, but the implications of the report, which would seem to cast censure on the present administration for these large augmentations, could have no foundation in fact, and must find their application elsewhere.

The business of internal improvement was the first head of increase which Mr. B. would mention; and that business commenced, or rather assumed its expended and invigorated form, in the year 1824—the last year of Mr. Monroe's administration—and under whose auspices and recommendations no person could better tell than the distinguished author of the present report. Internal improvement was then, and at that early time, the inviting ocean, upon which many candidates for popular favour were seen to spread the entire surface of their distended canvass. Commenced upon national principles, and with the design of being confined to national objects, the whole system rapidly degenerated into local, or neighbourhood contrivances, for the expenditure of money, and the acquisition of popularity. Before the end of Mr. Adams's four years, the downward course of the system had established the truth of the double prediction which Mr. Jefferson had made shortly before his death; it had opened a gulf which the treasures of Peru and Mexico could not fill! It had produced a scramble for money, in which the meanest got most! President Jackson found this system at that pass, with the immense augmentation of money expended, and men employed, which it necessarily involved; and the consequent increase of Executive patronage, which these augmentations implied. Far from enhancing, or even retaining this branch of patronage, he involuntarily stripped himself of it. At the risk of some danger to his temporary popularity, he stood forth to oppose the barrier of the Executive veto to the fatal current of local and neighborhood internal improvement. He endeavoured to turn back the system, and to confine it to its original design, that of great national objects. So far, then, as this head of increased expenditure, and increased numbers, employed by the Federal Government, has been a source of augmented patronage to the Executive Government, President Jackson is free from blame; so far as diminution of patronage has resulted from the arrestation of the fatal and ruinous part of this system; he alone is entitled to the exclusive honour.

Revolutionary pensions, Mr. B. said, was the next source which he would point out of those augmentations which were so conspicuously depicted in the report; and here the prolific source of an immense augmentation was revealed. Forty thousand pensioners, including the invalids of the last war, started to our view; near three millions of dollars were required to pay them, and he believed in 1833, it was near four millions. Who opened this fountain of Executive patronage? this prolific source

of expenditure and of revolutionary hero resurrection, which, at the end of half a century, is exhibiting a larger army on the pension roll than ever Washington saw, at any one time, on the muster roll? which furnishes the author of this report with upwards of one-third of his hundred thousand men? which is now making the revolution cost more money than it cost while it was existing and raging? and which has produced a demoralization of morals, and a perpetration of crimes, as revolting to the mind as it is humiliating to the country? Who produced all this? Certainly not President Jackson? but the action of Congress, under Executive recommendations, commencing at a period with which the author of this Report must be most familiar, and carried on to the year 1832, when the system of pensioning received its climax in the law of that year, and in the production of consequences which astonish and affect the country.

The removal of the Indians was the next source of increased expenditure, and increased agents, which Mr. B. adverted to; and on this head, far from disclaiming, he claimed the merit of it almost exclusively for President Jackson. It was he who had stood forth the true friend of the Indians, the true advocate and assertor of STATE RIGHTS, in relieving the Southern States of their Indian population, at the same time that he provided for these Indians themselves permanent, tranquil, unmolested, and far more desirable homes, in the rich and extended plains of the far West. In executing this policy, Congress acted under his recommendation; and to him the long neglected and injured South—the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and the new States of the northwest, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, are all, all indebted, for the advantages and blessings which they now enjoy in their freedom from the incubus of a useless and inimical population within their borders. The exodus of the Indians from the East to the West of the Mississippi—from the land of the white man to the land of the red man—under the guiding and protecting hand of President Jackson, has been to both parties, to the white race and to the red race, an auspicious and delightful consummation, on which Heaven has shed its benignant blessing, and which calls for the grateful emotions of every heart, white or red, civilized or savage, which can rejoice in the prosperity of the human race, and feel gratitude and thankfulness to its greatest and most eminent benefactor. But above all, and more than all put together, should the State of Mississippi feel that gratitude. Hard was her fate until General Jackson ascended the Presidential chair. The oldest Territory in the Union, a State for almost twenty years, a delicious climate, ample boundaries, lands adapted to the production of the richest staple, noble rivers—with all these advantages, her population remained a speck in the corner of her own extended map. The Chickasaws and Choctaws occupied the finest portions of her soil, and seemed destined to occupy them for ever under the abetment of a great political party, then called national republicans, now whigs, whose policy was as cruel to the Indians as it was unjust to the People, and subversive of the rights of the State. President Jackson appeared at the head of the national affairs. He was the slave of no selfish, or ambitious policy, the hunter of no factitious and delusive popularity. He was the friend of the whites and of the reds; he spoke the language of truth, justice, wisdom, to both; and the long depressed and obscured State of Mississippi, finds herself, as if by magic, in the possession of all her rights, and all her soil, advancing with rapid strides to wealth and population; displaying a prodigious expansion of both, and ready, at the census of 1840, to present six or eight members on that floor of the House of Representatives, where until lately, she had but one member, and now has but two. More! The graduation principle, by treaty is adopted for the sale of the newly acquired lands, descending down through successive gradations from \$1 25 to six and a quarter cents per acre! So that this State has acquired by treaty, under the auspices of President Jackson, the justice and the boon which her elder sisters have been in vain soliciting from Congress for so many years. For all this, that noble State is indebted to President Jackson; and it is as honourable to the inhabitants of that State, as it is just and right in itself, that the throb of gratitude beats in the hearts, and the sentiment of affectionate respect glows in the bosoms of almost the whole of her entire population. And shall the expense of these measures, the expense of freeing not only Mississippi, but the whole south, and the entire northwest, from the encumbrance of an Indian population, be now set down, without explanation, in a grave Report on Executive patronage, as one of the wasteful extravagancies of the day which portends the decline and fall of the Republic, and calls for the trenchant hand of cutting reform, and the indignant verdict of public reprobation?

Closely allied to this head, that of removal of Indians was another, which Mr. B. would mention, and which was too intimately connected with that head to require the detail of explanation. It was the great acquisition of lands, by the extinction of Indian titles, the fair and full price, now for the first time al-

lowed for them, and that by an administration depicted as the destroying angel of the red race; the consequent increase of surveyors and land offices, and the additional expense resulting from all these wise and patriotic operations. They, too, belong to President Jackson's administration; and Mr. B. claimed the honour of them for him, instead of confounding the increased expenditure resulting from them, and the increased number of persons employed to execute them in the indiscriminate mass of extravagancies denounced.

Another subject he would mention, the great increase of the tariff in 1824, and 1828, on the eve of Presidential elections, and the complicated nature of their provisions to prevent evasions, detect smuggling, give the full benefit of their enactments to the manufacturers, and to carry out the protective principle in the living bodies of revenue officers to defend it, as well as in the ramparts of parchments, intrenching it to the teeth, which Congress was piling up around it. Here was a great source of additional expense, additional officers and agents employed, and additional patronage conferred; and which now has brought the collection of the custom-house revenue, with the diminution of the tariff, to the inordinate expense of nine per centum. But who did all this? Not the administration; and therefore the remedy does not lie in the change of the administration; but Congress—Congress did it; and therefore the evil lies in the hands of the People themselves.

Mr. B. repeated; he concurred with the general purport, and the general object of the Report, in the great and striking augmentation which it presented of money expended, and men employed, or fed, by the Federal Government; and the necessity for great and real retrenchment in both particulars, especially as many of the objects for which they were incurred were temporary in their nature, and evanescent in their existence. Yes, said Mr. B. the augmentations have been great; but so far as they are of questionable propriety, they have had their root in previous administrations, some of them in the administration of Mr. Monroe, when the author of this Report was a distinguished member of that administration; others of these questionable measures had originated under Mr. Adams's administration, or in Congress itself, and under the high pressure speeches, reports, and motions of gentlemen opposed to the administration of President Jackson; and what should never be forgotten, it was the exercise of the veto power by President Jackson, which checked these extravagant expenditures of questionable objects, for which he received unmeasured denunciation! And let the people now mark it! This same President is now blamed just as much for not stopping, as he was blamed for stopping those wild expenditures.

But, Mr. B. said while agreeing to much that was in the Report, and in agreeing that there was not only room, but necessity for retrenchment, it would be unjust to the people, who have no means of detecting the delusive and fallacious statements which go forth with the high sanction of the Senate's approbation, to let this Report go forth among them to startle, alarm, disquiet, and amaze them with the idea that the expenses of the Government had doubled in nine years, from 1825 to 1833. Never was a wilder proposition presented to the intelligence of a rational people, not that the quantity of money paid out in the last of those two years, and that exclusive of the public debt in both instances, was not in reality double that of the former, but the fallacy and delusion lay in this: that those great additional payments were not for the expenses of the Government, not for ordinary, usual, current, and progressive expenditures, but for unusual, extraordinary, individual, isolated, and anomalous objects, occurring once, and but once, finished forever, when paid one time; some of them impossible, and others improbable to occur again; and, therefore, not fit to be held up among the current expenses, and progressive extravagance of the Government.

The Report, said Mr. B. assumes the years 1825 and 1833 for the comparison and contrast, which it exhibits, the expenditure of the former being eleven millions and a half, that of the latter twenty-two millions and three quarters, and both exclusive of payments on account of the public debt, and this, as the Report affirms, "during a period of profound peace, when not an event had occurred calculated to warrant any unusual expenditure." Now, said Mr. B. let us see what extraordinary expenditure fell upon the year 1833. First, there was the Black Hawk war, on the Upper Mississippi, which, though the fighting is done in 1832 yet the payments fell chiefly upon the ensuing year. Under this head alone there were payments in that year to near \$900,000,* namely, to the militia and volunteers of Illinois, \$442,000;

*Precise sums are here substituted in the published speech for the general statements made in the speech when delivered. Mr. B. had heard the Report read but once in the Committee, and had not obtained, when he spoke, the precise detail of sums enumerated. He obtained them afterwards, and produced, read and commented upon them in the

for their subsistence, \$186,000; for the conversion of rangers into a regiment of dragoons, \$274,000. Then there was paid for duties refunded on merchandise to importing merchants, the sum of \$701,760; then there was paid to claimants under the convention with Denmark, the sum of \$663,000; and this was money not expended, nor even paid, in the sense of payment, but merely delivered to these claimants; the Government having received it from Denmark, for their use, some years ago, and now delivered it to those to whom a commission had awarded it. Then there were extraordinary Indian treaties that year for the purchase of land, for which \$735,000 were paid, and removal of Indians, and subsisting them after they got to their new homes, the sum of \$368,000. But the greatest extraordinary payment of the whole year was that of revolutionary pensions, under the fatal act of 1832. That act originated in Congress, and carried back its loose and wild provisions to take effect from the 4th of March, 1831. This threw the accumulated payments under that most unfortunate act, upon the year 1833, for the remainder of the year 1832, in which the act was passed, was taken up in establishing the claims of persons to the benefit of the act. Thus the payments in 1832 were but \$355,686, while in 1833, they were ten times that sum, amounting in fact to \$3,507,484. Putting these extraordinary payments together, said Mr. B., and you have a sum of about seven millions of dollars at once to be deducted from the grand aggregate of twenty-two millions and three-quarters; and he had no doubt but that a research into the whole list of extraordinaries for the same year would produce a million more. Be that as it may, here is a sum of seven millions, not belonging to the current and progressive expenses of the government, carried forward to the gross amount of such expenditure, and made the means of exhibiting a duplication of the expenses of the Government in the short space of eight years.* Here is the fallacy, here the delusion; and hence the injustice of basing upon this duplication a cry of such enormous extravagance as to justify revolution if we cannot get reformation. For reformation there is room; for revolution there is no pretext; and the reformation of the ballot box Mr. B. confidently hoped would answer the exigency, and bring down the expenses of the Government properly so called,—the expenses necessarily incurred in working the machinery of the Government—to a sum much below what it would be after deducting the seven or eight millions of extraordinaries from the gross expenditure of twenty-two millions and three quarters in 1833.

To confirm his view and to show that those seven or eight millions of extraordinaries ought not to be added to the ordinary expenditures of the Government, much less to be charged to its extravagance and indicating a progressive expenditure which ought to rouse and alarm the country, Mr. B. would advert to the amount of the expenditures for the whole eight years comprehended in the Report, premising that payments on account of the public debt are, in all cases, excluded. The successive annual expenditures then stand thus:

For 1825,	-	-	-	\$11,490,459
1826,	-	-	-	13,062,316
1827,	-	-	-	12,653,025
1828,	-	-	-	13,296,041
1829,	-	-	-	12,659,490
1830,	-	-	-	13,229,533
1831,	-	-	-	13,864,067
1832,	-	-	-	16,516,388
1833,	-	-	-	22,713,755

From this view, Mr. B. said the increase of expenditure would appear not quite so frightful as this Report would represent. For the first year of the term, the increase was about a million and a half; for the next five years there was no increase of any moment, and twice there was a diminution. The years 1832 and 1833 had run up to large amounts, and that by the means which he had shown; so that if the author of the Report had taken for the basis of his comparison the seven years of regular expenditure, he would have found an increase of about two millions only, instead of a duplication of eleven millions; a result which, while it would have presented something for reformation, would have presented nothing for revolution, or even for turning out the party in power, and putting in their opponents, who are the real authors of every thing which requires reform.

Having shown the fallacy of the Report in its exhibit of the

Senate; and therefore feels justifiable in substituting precise sums for the general statements which he could only make, at this part, of the spoken speech.

* As well might the five millions in the French Spoliation Bill, which has passed the Senate and now lies in the House of Representatives, be set down, if it passes that body, also, among the Government expenditures for the year 1835, and carried forward to swell the aggregate of the year, to furnish contrasts, and excite discontent against an extravagant administration.

extravagance of the Government, having shown its enormous error in stating that this great increase had taken place during a period of profound peace, when in fact there was an Indian war on the Upper Mississippi! and when not an event occurred to warrant unusual expenditure, when in fact seven millions of the expenditures were for objects, not only unusual, but never existing before or since! Mr. B. would say a word, and but a word, upon its correlative part, the increase of persons paid by the Government or fed by its bounty. In 1825 the whole number was 55,777, in 1833, 100,073. This, said Mr. B. is almost double; but how did it happen? why from carrying the pensioners up from about 17,000 to about 40,000! adding multitudes for internal improvement, and the custom houses in consequence of the two trifts of 1824 and 1828; requiring many persons to superintend the removal of Indians; many to survey and sell the newly acquired lands; and a whole regiment of dragoons for the defence of the Western frontier. In these items, and others, the source of the increased numbers will be found; some few of them necessary and indispensable, as that of the dragoons; some necessary and temporary, as those for removal of Indians, and Internal Improvement; some lawful, though the expediency of the law unquestionable, as those for carrying into effect the complex provisions of the new tariff laws; some amazing, and almost incredible, as the increase of pensioners, the bare statement of whose numbers announces a fraud of stupendous magnitude, and implies a demoralization of public morals, of frightful enormity.

The dismissals from office next engaged Mr. B.'s attention. The affected moderation of language under which this topic was brought forward in the Report, and the violence with which it concluded, were particularly pointed out. Remarks of a party character were disclaimed, and the disclaimer was instantly followed by a series of the most violent and offensive remarks of a party character. The present administration was charged with having reduced to a system the practice of removing from office for opinion's sake. The assertion, though veiled, and slightly made to wear the form of hypothesis, was nevertheless clear and explicit in the Report, that the honest and capable were dismissed to make room for the base and corrupt; that offices were the spoils of victory, the rewards of partisan service, and the means of substituting manworship for patriotism, encouraging vice and discouraging virtue, preparing for the subversion of liberty and the establishment of despotism, and converting the entire body of office-holders into corrupt and supple instruments of power!! Such he said was the language of a Report which set out with a formal disclaimer of party spirit and partisan remarks. In defending the administration from such flagrant charges, Mr. B. would first discriminate between terms which had been much confounded and abused, and then show that the removals made by President Jackson, like those made by President Jefferson, were the legitimate results of the previous system of appointments, and were necessary not only to the safety and success of a democratic administration, but due as an act of justice to the great democratic party of the Union. Terms, he said, were confounded. When a man had been five, ten, twenty, forty years in office, and failed to be reappointed at the end of his second, third, fourth, or fifth term of four years, it was called a dismissal, and the cry of persecution was set up. This, Mr. B. said might be correct phraseology with those who thought officers ought to be for life, and eventually hereditary, but it was a phraseology repudiated in the democratic school, where the doctrine of right to office was repudiated and the right of rotation was inculcated. With respect to the fact of dismissals, they resulted in general from appointments. The elder Mr. Adams appointed none but federalists; and Mr. Jefferson had to turn a portion of them out in order to get in a portion of the republicans; and Mr. Jefferson had told him, (Mr. B.) that he had never carried changes far enough; that he had not done justice to his own party. So of President Jackson; the younger Mr. Adams followed the plan of his father, and President Jackson had to follow the course of Mr. Jefferson. Mr. B. said that his recommendation for any office in his own State was worth nothing during the whole administration of Mr. Adams, and the latter part of the administration of Mr. Monroe; and the State to this day contained some persons in office, his decided opponents who were appointed under the two former administrations. Doubtless, he said, President Jackson had made some unfortunate recommendations though he had made but few; but it was incontestably true that many of those who had been dismissed, or not reappointed, were themselves proscribers of those who were in their power; dismissing not only clerks and under officers for political opinions, but mechanics, workmen, and laborers! Yes, the day laborer, when he would not prostitute his vote to the national republicans, and the Bank has been dismissed from his labor!

The unregulated state of the deposit banks was another source of Executive patronage which the report had strongly and emphatically dwelt upon. Of all the matter contained in the re-

port, nothing, said Mr. B. except one thing, which he would mention in its proper place, had astonished him so much as this! Not there was not increase Executive patronage from this source, but that the President should be reproached with it in this Senate, by the author of this report, and the majority of the Committee from which it came. What is the fact? exclaimed Mr. B. Did not this Senate twice refuse, at their last session, to pass any law to regulate the deposit banks? Did not the majority of this committee twice refuse to pass a bill for that purpose? did not the author of the Report twice refuse to attempt to regulate these Banks? Are not the votes of these refusals recorded in our journals, preserved in our memories, and known to the whole body of the American People? And after that, is the Senate the place from which a reproach can come, and fearful, trembling, awful apprehensions for the safety of the Republic, can be put forth, on account of the unregulated condition of these Deposit Banks, without exciting, in the first place, a feeling of the utmost possible astonishment; and, in the next place, a feeling very different from astonishment, and of which he Senate should never aspire to make itself the object. Mr. B. would dismiss this topic with simply exciting the reminiscences, as the novel writers called it, which belonged to this occasion, and leave it to those who refused,—twice refused,—only nine months ago, to comply with the Executive recommendation to regulate these Banks, and now reproach him because they are not regulated, and shiver with terror at such a state of things; he would leave it to them, and a pretty little task they might find it! to reconcile their conduct then with their conduct now.

The transfer drafts, said Mr. B., have claimed the attention of the Report. They are proposed to be prohibited in future, except for the bona fide purpose of transferring public moneys from one place to another, for the benefit of the public service. To this Mr. B. had no objection. He was not in favor of using the power or the money of the Federal Government to sustain banks in future. Time was when the Government was under a virtual duress to do it. Fifteen or twenty years ago, for example, when the Government was itself dependent on the paper system, and was obliged to support that system to preserve its own revenues. Time was also when it was not only right, but laudable in the Government to sustain the local banks; and that was at the commencement of the panic operations of the last year, when the explosion of the State banks was the criminal policy of the Bank of the United States; and the success of that policy was frustrated by the interposition of the Secretary of the Treasury, through the instrumentality of transfer drafts. But these times have gone by. They have passed away; and can never return until the Federal Government shall commit the consummate folly of creating another mammoth bank, or entangling itself in the fate of local banks by continuing to treat their notes as money, and receiving the federal revenue in them. It is hoped that this folly will not be perpetrated; that no new bank is to be created to overthrow, and to crush at its pleasure, all others; that the paper of local banks is not to be made the currency of the Federal Government; but that the Government will, and that with all convenient speed, return to the currency of the constitution, and to the first act of the first Congress that ever sat under the constitution, and made a provision on the subject of money, and which declared that gold and silver coin ONLY should be received in payments to the United States. For the future, then Mr. B. was opposed to lending the aid of the Federal Government to the support of banks. If they cannot stand, let them fall. Let them blow up if they will; sky-high, if they please; high enough never to fall back to the earth! But, while concurring with the report in the future restriction upon the use of transfer drafts, he took the opportunity, most emphatically, to dissent from the censure which the report by implication, if not in words, threw upon Mr. Taney for the use he made of these drafts in the fall of 1833. He defended that use; he justified it; he extolled it; he celebrated it above all praise. What was that use? It was to prevent the success of crime, and to compel the observance of justice! to frustrate the conspiracy of the Bank of the United States, against the local Banks, and to compel her to treat her own notes, and those of her branches, as money! The case was this: Upon the removal of the deposits, many of the branches began to refuse to receive from the deposit Banks the notes of the other branches, or of the Mother Bank, which had been received in payment of duties, and which the deposit Banks offered to exchange for their own. Refusing this exchange, and demanding specie from the deposit Banks for all their balances, the design of the Federal Bank was evident; it was to cripple, and crush the State Banks, destroy their currency, and upon their ruins erect the edifice of her own necessity and supremacy and recharter. Mr. Taney interposed to prevent this crime, this ruin, and this result. He gave drafts to the deposit Banks to be used upon condition, and on condition only, that the Bank and its branches should continue to refuse to receive each others' notes, received on public account, in exchange for the

notes of the deposit banks, and demand specie from them; and the exhibition of these drafts in Baltimore and in New York had the effect that was intended; it compelled the Bank of the United States and its branches to honor each others' paper, and to desist from that part of their atrocious, and diabolical plan to break the deposit Banks, and to derange the currency of the country. Mr. B. said, these were the facts which justified Mr. Taney for the use he had made of the transfer drafts; not only justified him, but entitled him to the highest praise. He contented himself now with stating these facts; on another occasion he would prove them. He had certain remarks to make on the Report of the Finance Committee of the Senate, (Mr. Tyler's Report on the Bank,) in which this proof would find an appropriate place; and he was certain that the Senate would not deny him an opportunity of making his intended remarks. Looking at Mr. Tyler, he repeated, that the Senate would not deny him that opportunity; and Mr. Tyler was understood to say, that certainly he would not be denied.

Mr. B. came next to the proposition in the Report to amend the constitution for eight years, to enable Congress to make distribution among the States, Territories, and District of Columbia, of the annual surplus of public money. The surplus is carefully calculated at \$9,000,000 of dollars per annum for eight years; and the rule of distribution assumed, goes to divide that sum into as many shares as there are Senators and Representatives in Congress; which the Report shows would give for each share precisely \$30,405; and then leaves it to the State itself, by a little ciphering, in multiplying the aforesaid sum of \$30,405, by the whole number of Senators and Representatives which it may have in Congress, to calculate the annual amount of the stipend it would receive.* This process the Report extends through a period of eight years; so that the whole sum to be divided to the States, Territories, and District of Columbia, would amount to seventy-two millions of dollars.

Of all the propositions which he ever witnessed, brought forward to astonish the senses, to confound recollection, and to make him doubt the reality of a past, or present scene, this proposition, said Mr. B., eclipses and distances the whole! What? the Senate of the United States—not only the same Senate, but the same members, sitting in the same chairs, looking in each others' faces, remembering what each had said only a few short months ago, now to be called upon to make an alteration in the constitution of the United States, for the purpose of dividing seventy-two millions of surplus money in the Treasury, when that same Treasury was proclaimed, affirmed, vaticinated, and proved up upon calculations, for the whole period of the last session, to be sinking into bankruptcy! that it would be destitute of revenue by the end of the year, and could never be replenished until the deposits were restored! and the usurper and despot driven from the high place which he dishonoured and abused! This was the cry then; the cry which resounded through this chamber for six long months, and was wafted upon every quarter of the Republic, to alarm, agitate, disquiet, and enrage the People. The author of this report, and the whole party with which he marched under the *oriflamme* of the Bank of the United States filled the Union with this cry of a bankrupt Treasury; and predicted the certain and speedy downfall of the administration, from the want of money to carry on the operations of the Government.

[Mr. CALHOUN here rose and wished to know of Mr. B. whether he meant to include him in the number of those who had predicted a deficiency in the revenue.]

Mr. B. said he would answer the gentleman by telling him an anecdote. It was the story of a drummer taken prisoner in the Low Countries, by the videts of Marshal Saxe, under circumstances which deprived him of the protection of the laws of war. About to be shot, the poor drummer plead in his defence that he was a non-combatant; he did not fight and kill people; he did nothing, he said, but beat his drum in the rear of the line. But he was answered, so much the worse; that he made other people fight, and kill one another, by driving them on with that drum of his in the rear of the line; and so he should suffer for it. Mr. B. hoped that the story would be understood, and that it would be received by the gentleman as an answer to his question, as

* Mr. B. in a subsequent speech, told an amusing anecdote to the Senate, of the blunder into which a member had fallen with respect to the distribution of these \$30,405. The first time that Mr. B. saw the member, after the Report was read, he was violently for it, and wondered that any Senator, or Representative, should go against it. The next time he saw him he was indifferent, and even contemptuous to the Report. Mr. B. desired to know the reason of this sudden change? and it was accounted for thus: When the member first heard the Report read, he understood these \$30,405 annually, to be intended for the members themselves; but he now saw that every member would have to divide with his constituents; and he had 40,000 in his district; so that it reduced the thing to nothing; he would get but four shillings and six pence, Virginia money; and then he swore that he would not change the constitution of the United States for four shillings and six pence, Virginia money.

neither in law politics, or war, was there any difference between a hatw man did by himself, and did by another. Be that as may, said Mr. B. the strangeness of the scene in which we are now engaged remains the same. Last year it was a bankrupt treasury, and a beggared government; now it is treasury gorged to bursting with surplus millions, and a government trampling down liberty, contaminating morals, bribing, and wielding vast masses of people from the unemployable funds of countless treasures. Such are the scenes which the two sessions present, and it is in vain to deny it; for the fatal speeches of that fatal session have gone forth to all the borders of the Republic. They were printed here by the myriad; franked by members by the ton weight; freighted to all parts by a decreed and overwhelmed Post Office; and paid for! paid for! by whom? Thanks for one thing at least! The Report of the Finance Committee on the Bank (Mr. Tyler's Report) effected the exhumation of one mass, one mass! of hidden and buried putridity; it was the printing account of the United States for that session of Congress which will long live in the history of our country under the odious appellation of the PANIC-SESSION. That printing account has been dug up; it is [the black vomit of the Bank! and he knew the medicine which could bring forty such vomits from the foul stomach of the old red harlot. It was the medicine of a Committee of Investigation, constituted upon parliamentary principles; a committee composed, in its majority, of those who charged misconduct, and evinced a disposition to probe every charge to the bottom; such a committee as the Senate had appointed at the same session, not for the Bank! but for the Post Office.

Yes, exclaimed Mr. B., not only the Treasury was to be bankrupt, but the currency was to be ruined. There was to be no money. The trash in the Treasury, what little there was, was to be nothing but depreciated paper, the vile issues of insolvent pet banks. Silver, and United States Bank notes, and even good bills of exchange, were all to go off; all to take leave, and make their mournful exit together; and gold! that was a trick unworthy of countenance; a gull to bamboozle the simple, and to insult the intelligent, until the fall elections were over. Ruin, ruin, ruin to the currency, was the lugubrious cry of the day, and the sorrowful burthen of the speech for six long months. Now, on the contrary, it seems to be admitted that there is to be money, real good money in the Treasury, such as the fiercest haters of the pet banks would wish to have; and that not a little, since 72 millions of surpluses are proposed to be drawn from that same empty Treasury in the brief space of eight years. Not a word about the ruined currency itself. The very word seems to be dropped from the vocabulary of gentlemen. All lips closed tight, all tongues hushed still, all allusion avoided, to that once dear phrase. The silver currency doubled in a year; four millions of gold coined in half a year; exchanges reduced to the lowest and most uniform rates; the whole expenses of Congress paid in gold; working people receiving gold and silver for their ordinary wages; such are the results which have confounded the prophets of woe, silenced the tongue of lamentation, expelled the word CURRENCY from our debates; and brought the People to question, if it cannot bring themselves to doubt, the future infallibility of those undaunted alarmists who still go forward with new and confident predictions, notwithstanding they have been so recently and so conspicuously deceived in their vaticinations of a ruined currency, a bankrupt Treasury, and a beggared government.

But here we are, said Mr. B., actually engaged in a serious proposition to alter the constitution of the United States for the period of eight years, in order to get rid of surplus revenue: and a most dazzling, seductive, and fascinating scheme is presented; no less than nine millions a year for eight consecutive years. It took like wild fire, Mr. B. said, and he had seen a member,—no, that might seem too particular,—he had seen a gentleman who looked upon it as establishing a new era in the affairs of America, establishing a new test for the formation of parties, bringing a new question into all our elections, State and Federal, and operating the political salvation, and elevation of all who supported it, and the immediate, utter, and irretrievable political damnation of all who opposed it. But, Mr. B. dissented from the novelty of the scheme. It was an old acquaintance of his, only new vamped and new furnished, for the present occasion. It is the same proposition, only to be accomplished in a different way, which was brought forward some years ago by a Senator from New Jersey, (Mr. Dickerson,) and which then received unmeasured condemnation, not merely for unconstitutionality, but for all its effects and consequences; the degradation of men in the States, receiving their annual allowance from the bounty of the Federal Government; the debauchment of the public morals, when every citizen was to look to the Federal Government; the citizen was to look to the federal treasury for money, and every candidate for office was to outbid his competitor in offering it; the consolidation of the States, thus resulting from a central supply of revenue; the folly of collecting with one hand, to pay back with the other, and both hands to be greased at the

expense of the citizen who pays one man to collect the money from him, and another to bring it back to him, *minus* the interest and the cost of a double operation in fetching and carrying; and the eventual and inevitable progress of the scheme to the plunder of the weaker half of the Union by the stronger; when the stronger half would undoubtedly throw the whole burthen of raising the money upon the weaker half, and then take the main portion to themselves. Such were the main objections uttered against this plan seven years ago, when a gallant son of South Carolina, (General Hayne,) stood by his, Mr. B.'s side,—no, stood before him, and led him in the fight against that fatal and delusive scheme, now brought forward under a more seductive, dangerous, alarming, inexcusable, unjustifiable, and demoralizing form.

Yes, said Mr. B. it is not only the revival of the same plan for dividing surplus revenue, which received its condemnation on this floor seven or eight years ago, but it is the modification, and that in a form infinitely worse for the new States, of the famous land bill which now lies upon our table. It takes up the object of that bill, and runs away with it, giving nine millions where that gave three, and leaving the author of that bill out of sight behind; and can the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) be so short-sighted as not to see that somebody will play him the same prank, and come forward with propositions to raise and divide twenty, thirty, forty millions; and thus out-leap, out-jump, and out-run him in the race of popularity, just as far as he himself has now out-jumped, out-leaped, and out-run, the author of the Land Distribution Bill?

Yes, said Mr. B. this scheme for dividing surplus revenue is an old acquaintance on this floor; but never did it come upon this floor at a time so inauspicious—under a form so questionable,—and upon assumptions so unfounded in fact, so delusive in argument. He would speak of the inauspiciousness of the time hereafter; at present he would take positions in direct contradiction to all the arguments of fact and reason upon which this monstrous scheme of distribution is erected and defended. Condensed into their essence, these arguments are:

1. That there will be a surplus of nine millions annually for eight years.
2. That there is no way to reduce the revenue.
3. That there is no object of general utility to which these surpluses can be applied.
4. That distribution is the only way to carry them off without poisoning and corrupting the whole body politic.

Mr. B. disputed the whole of those propositions, and would undertake to show each to be unfounded and erroneous.

1. The report says that the surplus will probably equal, on the average, for the next eight years, the sum of \$9,000,000 beyond the just wants of the government; and in a subsequent part, it says, supposing the surplus to be distributed should average nine millions of dollars, annually, as estimated, it would give to each share 30,405 dollars, which multiplied by the Senators and Representatives of any State, would show the sum to which it would be entitled.† The amendment which has been reported to carry this distribution into effect, is to take effect for the year 1835,—the present year,—and to continue till the first day of Jan. 1843; of course it is inclusive of 1842; and makes a period of eight years for the distribution to go on. The amendment contains a blank which is to be filled up with the sum which is to be left in the treasury every year to meet contingent and unexpected demands; and the report shows that this blank is to be filled with the sum of two millions of dollars. Here then is the totality of these surpluses, eleven millions a year for eight consecutive years, out of which nine millions are to be taken annually for distribution. Now nine times eight are seventy-two; so that here is a report setting forth the enormous sum of \$72,000,000 of mere surplus, after satisfying all the just wants of the Government, and leaving two millions in the Treasury, to be held up for distribution, and to excite the people to clamor for their share of such a great and dazzling prize. At the same time, Mr. B. said, there would be no such surplus. It was a delusive bait held out to whet the appetite of the people for the spoils of their country, and could never be realized even if the amendment for authorizing the distribution should now pass. The seventy-two millions could never be found; they would exist no where but in this report, in the author's imagination, and in the deluded hopes of an excited community. The seventy-two millions could never be found; they would turn out to be the "fellows in Kendal green and buckram suits," which figured so largely in the imagination of Sir John Falstaff—the two-and-fifty men in buckram, which the valiant old knight received upon his point thus! (extending a pencil in the attitude of defence.) The calculations of the author of the report were wild, delusive, astonishing, incredible. He (Mr. B.) could not limit himself to the epithet wild, for it was a clear case of hallucination.